

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXV. No. 20.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 14, 1814. [Price 1s.]

609]

[610

ADDRESS

TO THE KING OF FRANCE.

No. II.

It is of the greatest importance, not only to France, but to mankind in general, that your Majesty should hear the *truth*. Perhaps, it is very improbable, that any thing which I write should reach your ear; but, at any rate, it will reach the ear of some persons; and, at the very least, there is a chance of its having some small degree of effect.—With this persuasion in my mind, I cannot resist the desire that I feel to contribute my utmost towards the cause of peace in Europe, and of liberty in France, whence, in the end, will, I trust, go forth a bright example to all oppressed and insulted nations.—It will be the duty of others, and they will be better able than I, to give you information of the sentiments, relative to you and your government, prevalent in other countries; but, it shall be my business, from time to time, to give you a true representation of these sentiments, as they prevail in England.—In my first Address to your Majesty, I had no hesitation to express my conviction, that, in a *short time*, those who had been the loudest in rejoicing at your being recalled to France, would be found the forwardest to express their disapprobation of your conduct, and to discover their unquenchable hatred of the French people. When, however, I said a *short time*, I meant *several months* at least. I little imagined, that you and your brave people would, even with the most malignant of these men, become objects of attack in so short a space of time as fourteen days, and in less than a month from the day of your departure from England; in less than a month from the date of those rejoicings and those memorable embracings, with which your recall to the throne of your forefathers was hailed in England, where you had been hospitably permitted to lead so quiet a life for many years before.—This has, nevertheless, happened. The writers, who professed to be your best and

most firm friends, are already beginning to carp at your proceedings; and are using their utmost endeavours to make your recall an event to be regretted by the people of France, and even by yourself. They now discover very clearly, that which we charged them with before, but which they constantly denied to be true; namely, that their hatred was to *France*, and not to the Emperor Napoleon, or any of his predecessors in power; and that, they wished for, and endeavoured to accomplish, your restoration, not as the means of making France great, free, and happy; but, as the means of destroying her power, by plunging her into civil wars, and by making her people abject and miserable.—It is almost impossible for a mind, endued with the common feeling of humanity, to conceive that there are people in the world capable of entertaining such diabolical views; capable of coolly calculating on the profit to be derived from the degradation and misery of twenty-six millions of people, inhabiting the fairest part of the globe; capable even of using their utmost endeavours to cause such degradation and misery, and that, too, at the manifest risk of exposing to destruction a family, for whose restoration they have expressed the most anxious wish, and, upon the arrival of the event, the most enthusiastic joy.—I shall, however, show your Majesty, that such is really the case. I shall show you, that, in the minds of some people in England, the hatred towards France is not at all abated; that they are labouring with all their might to keep that hatred alive, not only in this country, but in all others; that they are endeavouring to excite fresh suspicions against France in the minds of the Allies; that they are exerting all their powers to make France a country to be pointed at with the finger of scorn for a century to come. And having shown this so clearly as I intend, I shall entertain little doubt, that my endeavours, which have in view the peace and happiness of both countries, will be attended with some good.—In a case like this, it will be

necessary for me to refer to, and to quote from, the particular publications to which I allude; and your Majesty, who have, of late years, had such ample opportunities of being informed as to the character of the prints, whence I shall make my extracts, will want no assistance from me to enable you to form a correct opinion with regard to the motives and the influence by which the publications have been produced.—The two Prints, to which only I shall, upon this occasion, refer, are the **TIMES** and the **COURIER**. It is sufficient to name them to your Majesty, to enable you to perceive the precise degree of weight which they carry, and the attention which they are entitled to from you and your counsellors.—In order to place the matter in as clear a light as possible, I will state, under distinct heads, the several charges that I make against the malignant writers, who, as I shall show, are, even before you are seated on your throne, endeavouring to lay the train of a new war between England and France.—I charge them, then,

- I. With endeavouring to produce a civil war in France, by the reviving and perpetuating of those political animosities, which the King has expressed his anxious wish to see buried in oblivion.
- II. With endeavouring to blacken the character of the French Marshals and the French army; to induce the king to slight and discourage them; to prevail on the Allied Sovereigns to break the Convention, made for the release of prisoners of war, and that, too, for the purpose of preventing the French prisoners from returning home.
- III. With suggesting to the Allies the necessity of keeping their armies in France (in violation of the said Convention), beyond the first day of June, and with proposing that England should pay the said troops, while so kept in France.
- IV. With proposing to the Allies, to compel the king of France to reduce his army in such a manner as to render his kingdom perfectly defenceless against any foreign power; and, at the same time suggesting, that the treaty of alliance, made between Great Britain and the Allies, against France, when under Napoleon, should be continued in full force now, and for twenty years to come.
- V. With suggesting to the Allies the idea, and, indeed, actually proposing to them

the measure, of stripping the Museums and Galleries of Paris of the Statues, Pictures, and other valuable curiosities, brought by the French armies from countries which they had conquered.

VI. With endeavouring to prevent, in the pending negotiations, the restoration of the old French Colonies to France.

VII. With inculcating the doctrine, that France, though Napoleon is overthrown, is still the same; that she is radically and systematically our enemy, and that suspicions and jealousies of France ought *for ever* to be awake in the breast of a Briton.

Such are the charges which I make against the malignant writers, who, I must repeat it, were amongst the very loudest in hailing the return of your Majesty to France; and, if I make these charges good, you will want nothing more to convince you of the truth of what I stated in my first Address; namely, that, in the whole world, you had not such bitter and such crafty enemies as some amongst those, who, all of a sudden, had become your flatterers in England. These men hoped, that your Majesty would carry back to France no feelings but those of resentment and revenge; that, at the instigation of incendiaries, you would plunge your country into a civil war; that you would turn your back upon that army, who alone are able to support your throne against foreign foes; that, in short, you would lay beautiful France prostrate at the feet of any petty potentate who should think proper to become her enemy. They have discovered, that your Majesty is not disposed to gratify their wishes and expectations; and, they have lost no time in seeking, *de longue main*, to collect the materials for revenge.—I now proceed to my charges in their regular order.

I.—I accuse these men, without pretending to know *who* or *what* they really are, of *endeavouring to produce a civil war in France, by the reviving and perpetuating of political animosities*.—It must be evident to all the world, that, after what has occurred in France, if an amnesty and an oblivion, as to the past, does not take place, there must be endless quarrels and feuds in that country. It must also be evident, that disputes as to opinions and political conduct and acts, must involve questions of *property*, and that, by a very natural progress, an attack upon the past political conduct of individuals would grow



into a general war of opinions and interests, ending, in all human probability, in another Revolution, after the nation had experienced all the evils of a civil war; or, in the parcelling of France out, and dividing it amongst the other Powers of Europe. These truths are so manifest, that they must be seen clearly by all the world. Yet (and now I come to my evidence) does the *TIMES* newspaper of the 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th of May, labour with all its might to inculcate the justice and necessity of exposing, by all manner of means, the conduct of Frenchmen, whom it accuses of acts of disloyalty.—On the 2d of May, this writer points out the injustice, as he insinuates, of taking into favour those who have been employed by Napoleon, or who have figured in the Revolution. He says, that “Marshals DAVOUST, MASSENA, and SOULT, and some others, pretty clearly show a *lurking* attachment to the cause of the deposed tyrant; or, rather, perhaps, their own wishes to succeed him as military despots.” He then goes on to say, that “a great proportion of the *prisoners of war in this country* are evidently inclined to support any such desperate measure.”—I need not point out to your Majesty, the baseness of these suggestions, especially against our own unfortunate prisoners of war. The crime of which they are here accused is that of fidelity to their commanders. But your Majesty will want no exposition of motives here, when you observe, that the malice of this writer is more particularly levelled against those, who have most distinguished themselves in fighting *against England*. It was the Prince of Essling who followed Lord Wellington to Lisbon; it was the Duke of Dalmatia who followed Sir John Moore to Corunna; and it was the Prince of Eckmühl who maintained possession of Hamburgh, with so much valour and perseverance.—But, the charge against the prisoners of war is still the most base. These unfortunate men, who have suffered so much for the sake of their *fidelity to France* (for that is the true light in which to view it), are to be suspected by you, and are to be degraded, if the malicious suggestions of this writer be listened to.—On the 8d of May, this same writer points out by name, a Monsieur THIBEAUDEAU, who, as this writer says, “voted for the death of Louis XVI, and against the appeal to the nation, by which that unfor-

“fortunate Monarch would, undoubtedly, have been preserved.” Thus setting a mark upon one public officer, to begin with, as a proper object of vengeance.—On the 4th of May, the same writer says, that “those who *palliate the crimes of France*, under the late government, are “the real enemies of the House of Bourbon, and those who proclaim aloud the “truth its surest friends,” amongst whom he gives the first place to an incendiary of the name of CHATEAUBRIAND, who seems to have formed the design of ingratiating himself with the vindictive, at the expense, if it must be so, of the peace and happiness of France.—On the 5th of May, the same writer insists upon the necessity of “branding” certain of the revolutionists “with *perpetual abhorrence*.”—On the 7th of May, the same writer insists on the necessity, that, upon *some points*, as to the past, “the French nation ought to institute *formal inquiry*,” and, as one of the results of which he proposes, that all those French officers, who have escaped from imprisonment in England, shall be declared *infamous*. He says, that they are *very numerous*, and kindly offers to furnish a *list of their names*.—I dare say, that the offer will not be of any use, and that your Majesty, as well as those officers, will be contented to *take the will for the deed*.—On the 6th May, the same Print observed, “That *hypocritical wretch*, “MAURY, too, it is to be *feared*, will not “have his Cardinal’s robe *stripped off*. “His impious harangues still ring in our “ears, and yet we are told he continues “to inhabit the Archiepiscopal palace: “and presently, perhaps, he will have the “audacity to intrude himself into the presence of his Sovereign! If the *forfeited lives* of these wretches are spared, at “least they ought to be *exposed to public “scorn*, and *driven to obscurity*, and, if “possible, to penitence.” I have taken this Print for only one week. It has been constantly labouring at the same point. *Chateaubriand and the Axe*, appears to be this writer’s motto. You must make the scaffold stream with democratic blood, or, it is evident, that you will not satisfy this man.—Your Majesty remembers what the Stuarts did, upon their return to the throne of England; you remember how they hanged, and beheaded, and ripped up; and, you also remember *their fate*, which followed at no very distant day from their vindictive measures. But, even to them,

it never was proposed to punish, or to suspect, officers who had served in the wars of Cromwell, and who had so gallantly upheld the English name in arms. So far from that, they were confided in, employed, rewarded, and honoured. Yet would this writer have you suspect such men as Massena, Soult, and Davoust, because they have distinguished themselves in fighting against that country, to the people of which he now says, that, though Napoleon be overthrown, "France is still the SAME;" "France is radically and systematically our enemy."—To be convinced of the wicked, the detestable wishes of these writers, your Majesty has only to look, for a moment, at the pretended reasons, upon which they ground their assertion, that *an ample exposure of the late government is necessary*. They tell us, that, unless this exposure be made, in all sorts of ways, "there is no knowing to what dangers the Monarch may be exposed." Now, it will be borne in mind, that these same writers have a thousand times told us, that the tyranny of the late government weighed upon every living creature in France; that it had plunged every family into misery and mourning. What need, then, of exposure? Why should you be in any danger from the want of that exposure? What! is it necessary to go to the house of a man, whom the late government had plunged into ruin and despair, and expose to him the nature and the acts of that government, especially when he sees all his neighbours in the same condition?—The hypocrisy of this pretended reason, will, at once, show the malice of the advisers of persecution, and will convince your Majesty, that such advisers, when they say one thing, mean another.—What! they tell us to-day, that all France was bleeding at every pore, under Napoleon, and his officers of various descriptions; that every man, woman, and child, was in a state of misery; that all, that every soul, young and old, felt the weight of the despotism, and prayed without ceasing for your return; and, to-morrow, they tell us, that, unless prodigious efforts be made to expose the evils of the late government, your Majesty is in imminent danger!

II.—I charge these writers with endeavouring to blacken the character of the French Marshals and officers, and the French army; to induce the king to slight and discourage them; to prevail on the

Allied Sovereigns to break the Convention, recently entered into for the release of prisoners of war, and that, too, for the purpose of preventing the French prisoners of war from returning home.—We have seen above a specimen of the abuse of the French Marshals and officers. The TIMES of the 2d of May, calls Generals HULIN and BARROIS *villains*, and points them out as objects of vengeance. You are told, in the same print of the 6th of May, that your throne is raised on *moon-beams*, if you entrust your army to such men as your Marshals.—You, indeed, have expressed a precisely contrary opinion. You have said, that you will lean upon those Marshals; and this it is which has enraged these writers, be they who they may. But the abuse, thrown out by these men upon the whole of the French army, is quite indecent. I shall here quote whole passages from these writers; and as they apply to the III^d and IVth charges, as well as to the II^d, I will here repeat those charges, before I proceed to my quotations.

III. *With suggesting to the Allies the necessity of keeping their armies in France (in violation of the said Convention), beyond the 1st day of June, and with proposing that England should pay the said troops, while so kept in France.*

IV. *With proposing to the Allies to compel the King of France to reduce his army, in such a manner as to render his kingdom perfectly defenceless against any foreign power; and, at the same time suggesting, that the treaty of alliance, made between Great Britain and the allies, against France, when under Napoleon, should be continued, in full force, now and for twenty years to come.*

In support of these charges, I offer the following passages from the TIMES newspaper. "They" (the French prisoners of war) "had, for years, lived the life of *banditti*, and that sort of life is not without its charms for uneducated and unreflecting minds. These circumstances prove the necessity of *circumspection* and *firmness* in those to whom the welfare of Europe is committed, and who have, at the present moment, irresistible power in their hands. Before their armies are withdrawn, they must, for their own security, ascertain that the king's wishes will be put into execution. The Conscription must be abolished.—France cries out against it. Europe

“has a right to insist on its suppression. “It is also matter of most serious consideration, how the force is to be constituted “on which the king is henceforward to “rely for protection. It will be *easy* “to learn who, amongst the prisoners of “war in this country, have declared for “the lawful sovereign, and who for the “usurper. The latter should be *marked*. “Indeed the approaching peace will not “require a *large regular force* to be kept “up in France. The *national guard* will “form the *best support to the government*. “The military mania is as much a subject “of precaution now, as the democratic “mania was some years ago.”—TIMES, 2d May.—I must stop here for a moment to surmise what must be the feelings of a king of France upon reading these insinuations and remarks of his *friends*!—Base wretches! They would excite his suspicions of those whom we have so long had in captivity, and whom we are to have no longer! Poor fellows! Have they not yet suffered enough for their valour and fidelity! These wretches would, we see, become spies, in order to get the poor fellows *marked*. “It will be *easy to learn*.” Yes; but your Majesty will not, I am sure, accept of the offer. You will know well, that fidelity to their country and their cause ought to entitle these brave men to admiration, rather than to expose them to vengeance.—Your Majesty must laugh at this extreme regard for your welfare, which would strip you of all force but the national guard, at a time when Great Britain is advised, by the same kind friends of yours, to keep in full force, a treaty which provides for the support of 600,000 men in arms *against France*. And, as you will presently see, this plan of the National Guard comes from the very people, who recommend the carrying away from Paris of all the pictures and statues taken in Italy!—Your Majesty will want nothing further to guide your judgment as to this kind advice; this uncommon solicitude for your happiness.—But, to proceed: the same Paper of the 3d of May observes, that “France in her present *exhausted state*,” (who said she was exhausted?) “cannot “support a *large military establishment*,” (she best knows that) “and it is the bounden duty of the Allies to *proceed with* “caution. The additional expence of keeping their forces in France a few months longer, and of extending the term for the “payment of the subsidies on our part, is

“not to be put into the scale against the “risk of having **ALL OUR WORK TO “DO OVER AGAIN.**”—TIMES, 3d May.—Does not this sting your Majesty a little? How do you and your people feel upon reading publications like these? What is the feeling of those, who have carried the French arms to Vienna, Berlin, and Moscow?—What is the feeling of those, who have seen all Europe at their feet; and who have carried *light* and even *liberty* into the dungeons of the Inquisition?—The TIMES newspaper of the 6th of May contained the following paragraphs, with which I shall conclude the evidence on the 2d, 3d, and 4th charges.—Speaking of the Congress to be held for settling the affairs of Europe, the writer proceeds thus:—“It “would be well, whilst the victorious Sovereigns are casting their views so far “into futurity, that they would look a little “to the dangers that may without a miracle occur immediately under their eyes, “and possibly within the space of a few “months. They have sorely rued that accursed invention of revolutionary craft “and wickedness, the CONSCRIPTION; and “yet we do not hear that that *infamous* “and *detestable* institution is *abolished*. As “long as it exists, France must be, in the “energetic language of CHATEAUBRIAND, “*‘a den of robbers.’* Far from having “freed the world from this monstrous evil, “it seems that they are preparing to heap “new fuel on the flame, by pouring at once “*half a million of soldiers into France.*— “What are these men to do? They cannot dig. To beg they will be ashamed. “Are they to be at once disbanded? This “would fill all France with a *most desperate banditti*. Are they to be embodied “under the command of such mild and moderate leaders as Marshal Soult, and Marshal Davoust? If so, the throne of “Louis XVIII. is raised on moon-beams.” (What tender anxiety is here expressed for your Majesty!)—“The allied troops are “all to be withdrawn from France, and “that *unhappy* country is to be visited “with the *plague* of half a million *mad-men*, still thirsting for GLORY (as they phrase it). Even the disbanding of a “disciplined army, when armies used to “be less than one tenth as numerous “as they are now, was, by our prudent “ancestors, considered to be a matter “of much caution and delicacy.—How “much more important is it, to the *repose* “of France, and through her, of all Eu-

“rope, that the vast *hordes* which have been poured out from her bosom to ravage all parts of the Continent, should be restored gradually and quietly to their country, under such regulations and restrictions as would ensure their return to the habits and pursuits of peaceful industry. We earnestly hope that these considerations will have their weight with the Allied Sovereigns, and induce them to adopt a cautious system in replacing France on a basis of social order. We read too much in the addresses to the French Sovereign of the GLORY of the armies. That glory has been in the majority of instances an indelible disgrace to the French name, and a source of misery to all that France possesses of virtuous or truly noble. What glory was there in the massacre of Madrid, in the destruction of Saragossa, in the cruel persecution of the brave Hamburgers? We do not wish to revert to these scenes of horror; but when we see them alluded to in so very different a light, IT IS TIME TO SPEAK OUT.”—These are memorable words. When your Majesty considers whence they spring, they ought to make a deep impression upon your mind, and upon the minds of all Frenchmen.—If this man were asked why he has such an antipathy to the Conscription; why he is so uncommonly anxious to induce the Allies to compel you to abolish it, I wonder what his answer would be?—It is all out of pure regard for your Majesty!—Pure regard for you makes him so anxious about it! Pure regard for you will not let him rest, day or night, till he has got all your army quietly disbanded! Pure regard for you, too, as you are about to see; pure regard for the happiness of France, has induced him to press upon the Allies to remain with their armies in the French territory, and to take away with them your statues and pictures! If you doubt of the insincerity of such friends, your Majesty must be credulous indeed.

Thus have I produced proof of the truth of the 2d, 3d, and 4th charges; but, before I proceed to the others, I must offer a few remarks upon the passages which I have here quoted, in order more fully to expose the baseness of the writer, and the detestable motives whence his publications have sprung.

It is well known, and to this writer as well as to others, that there is a Convention, signed by our Minister and that of

France, according to which the allied armies are to evacuate the French territory by the 1st day of June; and, yet, in the face of this, this friend of your Majesty would fain have these armies remain longer, to harass and oppress the people of France. But, what are the alledged motives for this violation of a solemn compact, and that, too, while France has been fulfilling her part of it with all possible diligence? Why, to compel your Majesty to disband all your veteran soldiers; to lay down your army altogether, and to abolish the easy means of raising another! This measure, and upon such grounds, is openly recommended to the Allies, who entered France with a declaration, that France ought to be great and happy!

The writer says, that your soldiers, when they return, will be *banditti*. Who are these soldiers? The men raised by the Conscription. They will not dig, it is asserted, and to beg they will be ashamed.—Therefore, he recommends, that the Allies should, in the teeth of the Convention, keep them, and restore them gradually and quietly, and under such restrictions and regulations as shall ensure their return to the habits of peaceful industry.—In truth, he is afraid of them. He has witnessed their valour. He wishes them to rot in prison. He is not yet glutted with their unheard-of sufferings, which have all been unable to shake their fidelity to their country and its cause.—But, mark the hypocrisy of this man. He has been ringing in our ears, for months and months, the cruelty of the Conscription; he has been, with Mr. Canning, giving us the most pathetic descriptions of the weepings of the mothers and fathers of these poor conscripts; he has been deploring the fate of unhappy France, left to be cultivated by old men, women, and children, though, by the bye, she has always had corn to sell us. And now, behold! when the happy moment is arrived for the return of these poor youths to their mothers, he will not let them go! He is afraid that they will become *banditti*! He has lost all recollection of the tender parting scenes, and looks upon them as in love with a roving fighting life! And he is willing still to leave poor France to be tilled by old men, women, and children! What is the world to think of such a man? The truth is, he knows how brave and faithful they have been; and he wishes to see them die in captivity. England, in proportion to her

population, has had more men in arms than France. What does this man mean to do with them? Are they made of such materials as not to make them at all dangerous? Then there are, perhaps, two millions of soldiers belonging to the Allies. Are they to be kept in prison; or what is to be done with them? Is there no *military mania* any where but in France? The French soldiers are, it seems, neither to be *disbanded* nor *kept up*. No; he would have them stifled: he would have them pine out their lives in prisons. I wonder he does not propose, at once, the cutting of all their throats.—Your Majesty will hear of such sentiments with indignation and horror.

And, what reason has this man to suppose, that the French prisoners of war will not, if disbanded, be ready to fall into the habits and pursuits of *industry*? Experience would tell him to draw a contrary conclusion. For, was there ever heard of in the world more industrious and ingenious people than the Frenchmen in our prisons? Sabots, list shoes, leather shoes, lace, straw hats. In short, what did they not make, as long as they were *permitted*, in their prisons? It was necessary to *restrain them from working*. I remember one instance wherein a man and his son too, I believe, *were punished for supplying them with straw for their manufactures*! As to the liberality of the nation where this took place, as to the wisdom and justice of the prevention, I have nothing to say. It might all be very wise, just, and liberal; but that does not disprove the fact, that the French prisoners discovered, while in our keeping, *industry* surpassed only by their fortitude and fidelity. What danger can there be, then, to their country; what danger can there be to France, to send such men out of our prisons, and from the wilds of Siberia, to their fathers and mothers in their own fruitful and pleasant country? Your Majesty and the French nation will not fail to call to mind, that, for many years past, these same writers have been railing against Napoleon, on account of *his* not consenting to an exchange of the prisoners of war. He was represented as a most cruel and ungrateful monster, who suffered to die in *prisons* and in *hulks*, those who had fought his battles. Means in abundance were employed, by these writers, to instil such sentiments into the minds of the French prisoners, who had free access to publica-

tions of the kind. *They* were not convinced, it seems. But, what are we to think of the *sincerity* of these writers? What are we to think of the compassion they expressed for the prisoners of war? What are we to think of their imputations against Napoleon, because *he* would not agree to our terms of exchange? What are we *now* to think of all these professions on the part of these writers and their associates, when we see them doing all they can to prolong the duration of the captivity of these unfortunate Frenchmen, even after peace has been made with France, and that, too, accompanied with the restoration of the ancient family? Is there in France; is there in England; is there in the whole world, one generous, one humane bosom, which will not swell with indignation at the suggestions of such implacable and base malignity?

These writers, as your Majesty will perceive, are angry that Frenchmen should still talk of their *glory*. They find fault with the language that has passed between you and your Marshals, as calculated to flatter the *vanity* of the people. They call it *insolence* towards us and our Allies.—They say that such notions ought to be discouraged by you, because they tend to keep alive that *military mania*, which may be your ruin; and, lest this consideration should not have its weight with you, they appeal to the wisdom of the Allies, and call upon them to see your army reduced to National Guards, before they withdraw their troops from your territory. Now, what is the reason that you and your people are not to talk of the *glory* of the French army? Nothing that has happened can lessen the renown acquired by that army. Such prodigious feats of valour were never before performed by any nation in the world. No nation ever carried its arms to such an extent of conquest. All the capitals of the Continent have been in the hands of Frenchmen. No nation ever had the power to produce such wonderful changes in the state of society. The bare narrative of the *great* battles and victories of the French armies would fill many large volumes. *Why*, then, are the French not to be permitted to cherish the idea of their military *glory*? *Why* is your Majesty to be sneered at by these writers, because you rest upon those who have acquired this glory? Upon what ground is this language in France denominated *vanity* and *insolence*? What! do these men

expect, that, because their eye-balls are seared at the sight of the pages which record, and which will for ever record, the valour of the French arms, in so many battles against *all* the nations of the Continent; do they expect, that you and your people are to burn this record, that you are to efface all the means of calling to mind the heroic deeds of Frenchmen; do they expect, that, because *we* very naturally wish to drown the recollection of Coruana, the Helder, and of many other things, you and your people are to have the same wishes? Do they expect that you, above all others, are to act as if you thought your kingdom disgraced in the eyes of the world? Do they expect you to acknowledge yourself as the sovereign of a fallen people, and to endeavour to stifle in their bosoms that feeling, which alone can preserve your country from being parcelled out amongst invaders? This they do not *now* expect; and their rage proceeds from their disappointment. They blame your Majesty for preserving the *Legion of Honour*. They call it the creature of crime. They say, to maintain it is to sanction *immorality*. They forget, good moral souls, that our august and magnanimous Allies are *all* honorary members of *that Order*. Good moral souls, they forget, that the Emperors of Austria and Russia, the King of Prussia, the Crown Prince of Sweden, the King of Denmark, the Prince Regent of Portugal, the King of Bavaria, the King of Württemberg, the King of Saxony, the Grand Duke of Baden, together with the greater part of their principal Ministers and Generals, belong to this *Legion of Honour*. The good moral souls surely forget this, or they would not blame your Majesty for maintaining it. They surely would not call it the creature of *crime*, and the symbol of *immorality*.

But, it will strike your Majesty as something worthy of attention, that, while these writers, who, it must be observed, are not so very *singular* in their opinion as I could wish: it must strike you as worthy of attention, that, while these writers are so zealously endeavouring to dissuade your Majesty from giving the smallest degree of encouragement to the army of France; while they would even forbid you and your people to talk about *French* military glory; they discover no such dislike to the thing at *home*. We are permitted to talk about the *glory* that *we* have acquired in fighting

the French, and in our invasion of France. We make Dukes and Lords of those who have been fighting against France. We have made more Lords than France has made Marshals. And, even in our war, now to be carried on against the Americans, the fleets and armies are reminded of the *glory* they have gained in the war against France. Perhaps all the battles that we have been engaged in during this war of twenty years do not, in point of magnitude, amount to one battle like that of Austerlitz or of Marengo. And yet we are to talk of our military glory; we are to talk of it eternally; and the French, the poor insignificant French, are to be as silent as so many mice; *you* and *they* are to be accused of *vanity*, and even *insolence*, if you open your lips upon the subject of the achievements of the armies of France.—Whatever else your Majesty may think of these writers, you will certainly allow them to be the most *modest* of all mankind.

Your Majesty is called upon to look coldly upon your army of veterans. You are told, that their military notions are mischievous. You are assured that they are *banditti*, *vagabonds*, *robbers*; and that they ought by no means to be encouraged; that they, and even their *profession*, ought to be held in abhorrence, as tending to *national immorality*. You will not fail, however, to observe, that this opinion of these writers does not prevent them from approving of the honours and the pensions bestowed (I say not unjustly) on *our* fighters; and that they extol by anticipation the intention of our Government to make an addition to the *peace-pay* of our military and naval officers. These good moral men see *no danger* in all this. They see no danger in keeping alive, by all possible means, the love of a military life and of the military profession *here*. They can see no danger, indeed, of this being done in *any* country except France; a view of the subject, which would seem wholly irreconcilable to common sense, if we did not recollect, that the same persons have told us to look upon France as being radically and systematically *our enemy*; than which your Majesty will surely want no other explanation of this seeming inconsistency.

If, after what has been produced and observed, your Majesty could entertain the smallest doubt, that these writers and their associates wish you to adopt a line of conduct that would *cripple France*; make her a *feeble and contemptible nation*;

sink her for a century in the scale of power. If you could entertain the smallest doubt, that their first wish is the *degradation* of France, as the means of giving England a complete preponderance against her. If you could entertain the shadow of a doubt, that this is the main drift of all their present efforts, the proofs I am now about to produce, must remove even that shadow.

V.—I charge these writers *with suggesting to the Allies the idea, and, indeed, actually recommending the measure, of stripping the Museums and Galleries of Paris of the statues, pictures, and other valuable curiosities brought by the French armies from countries which they had conquered.*—My proof of the truth of this charge is in the following extract from the TIMES newspaper of the 2d of May.—After noticing, that the Emperor of Russia had expressed the intention of the Allies to be, to leave Paris in possession of all its curiosities; after censuring this, and adding a suitable quantity of observations on the “*robberies*,” the “*rapacity*,” and the “*vanity*” of the French nation, the writer proceeds thus:—“As the coalesced Powers have fairly conquered all the armies of that nation, who had so long indulged themselves in every species of rapine throughout Europe—and since these victorious Powers, by the capture of Paris, have, at their absolute disposal, the whole magazine of *revolutionary plunder*, wrenched by *fraud or violence* from its just possessors, who can avoid asking, how that plunder is to be disposed of? Can any man doubt, that if the public and private property of France be respected by the conquerors, the same conquerors are bound, by a ten-fold obligation, so far as to respect the public and private property of Flanders and Venice, of Florence and Rome, as to demand it peremptorily from those who have *stolen* it, and give it back to those from whom it was so *iniquitously stolen*? Not even a statue, not a medal, not a picture capable of removal, ought to be left where it can only serve to reward the systematic *robberies* of the French Government, and to stand the glittering evidence of successful crime. It is as the advocate of consistency, that one might call upon the triumphant defenders of public justice and honour, not to leave their triumph incomplete, not to leave the downfall of oppression a dis-

puted fact with posterity, by leaving it robbed in all its unprincipled acquisitions. Neither in liberality nor in policy, is it a matter of mean consideration, that the princes and nobles of the plundered kingdoms should be remitted to the bare walls of the ravaged temples and gutted palaces. What is modern Italy without her monuments? To the grave Italian, his country has no existence but in her annals. Why take from him the consolation of beholding the proofs of what he has been? Why break away the fine associations of every classic and cultivated mind, which connects the once inestimable treasures of the Vatican with the antiquity of letters and of arts, while in Florence it delights to meditate their revival? It may, to be sure, hurt somewhat of the *Parisian vanity*, to find the Louvre dissected by its emigrant Gods. The hall of the Apollo may affect the French connoisseur and savant with sombre feelings, when the Belvidere palace has recovered its immortal guest. —The Hall ‘des Hommes illustres,’ the Hall ‘des Romains,’ the Hall ‘du Laocoon,’ the Hall of the Muses, may have fewer admirers, when these splendid appellations become terms of ridicule, as they now are of reproach. But let us hope that our Allies may not imitate our enemies, by confounding the good and bad passions of mankind. Let us hope that, for the *sake of the French people themselves*, an act of high and important justice may not be set aside from regard to their *unworthy vanity* to that sentiment, by pampering which, more mischief has resulted to France and to the world, than centuries of peace and penitence can repay; that sentiment to which we may fairly trace the paroxysms of their military ambition, their fever of empire, and prodigality of blood.”

Here there is *no disguise*. There is nothing crafty. The design and the motive are openly avowed. But, be the event what it may, what must be the envy, the hatred, the rancour; how inveterate, how diabolical, the malice of the minds, in which such advice to the Allies could originate? Your Majesty will, probably, not have forgotten the glee of these same persons, when they saw a prospect of *Paris being burnt to ashes*. It is the same spirit that is at work here. It is a spirit of envy and of malice, that robs the mind of its reflecting powers. It

is a rancour against France and against Frenchmen, which knows no bounds; which loses sight of all consequences; which thinks nothing of wars, or of civil strife, in the pursuit of its gratification. Was there ever before heard of, in the whole world, such a thing as confounding *booty in war* with highway, or any other *robbery*? And, did ever any nation in the world make war for the recovery of such booty? The Allies, in their treaty concluded at Chaumont, no longer ago than the 1st of March last, stipulate in these words:—"The trophies and *booty* taken from the enemy, shall belong to the troops who take them." And yet have these malignant writers the impudence to advise the stripping of the Museums of Paris, upon the ground, that their contents were the fruit of *robbery*, though the terms of the capitulation of Paris expressly forbid any such act of spoliation.—However, it is not so much for the purpose of exposing the want of *reason* in these writers, and their associates and approvers, that I have noticed this part of their efforts, as for the purpose of clearly shewing, that the main object of this description of persons is to degrade, to beggar, to cripple France. They see in these famous Museums, and Libraries, and Galleries, the source of an immense and constant resort to Paris; they perceive that resort will tend to the advantage of France in a pecuniary way, at the same time that it cannot fail to extend and perpetuate the fame of the French armies. And, so bitter is their malice, that they would, I verily believe, plunge us into another long and bloody war, rather than leave this advantage to France. The exclusive possession of all the *trade* of the world is not sufficient for them. The means of paying all the armies in Europe to fight against France is not enough. A twenty years alliance against France, even that does not glut these men. They wish to leave her absolutely nothing but rags and dirt; and even of her soil we shall, I dare say, see, by and bye, that they wish to have all the fruit for nothing.—Your Majesty will surely admire their generosity, whatever you may think of their prudence.

We now come to my two last charges, namely:—

- VI. Endeavouring to prevent, in the pending negotiations, the restoration of the old French Colonies to France. And,
- VII. Inculcating the doctrine that France, though Napoleon is overthrown, is

STILL THE SAME; that she is radically and systematically our enemy; and that suspicions and jealousies of France ought FOR EVER to be awake in the breast of a Briton.

Ample proof of the truth of these will be found in the following article from the COURIER newspaper of the 6th of May, which article, from the whole of its appearance, became worthy of particular notice. It is written in a style above that of the ordinary style of the Paper. It had a distinct and conspicuous place allotted to it. Its tone is such as to induce one to believe, that it was intended to give a decided direction to public opinion upon the important subjects of which it treats. It would seem that the writer was afraid, that, in the hurry of the late scenes, public feeling had carried people away too far, and had led them, in their joy at the fall of Napoleon, to forget that antipathy which he wished to see kept alive against France, at all times, and under any dynasty, or any possible order of things.—"Most of our cotemporaries are talking of the preparations for the celebration of the general peace. That a general peace is indeed a subject for congratulation we do not of course mean to deny; but let us first have an insight into the terms. We know enough to be able to state that they will be founded upon the bases of the ancient limits of France, so far as they relate to France upon the Continent; France as she was in 1789 or 1792. But is this principle meant to be extended to her Colonies? This is what concerns us. Russia will get an extension of territory, Prussia get back her own with additions, so will Austria—But what are we to have? It may perhaps appear somewhat ungracious to suggest a single thought which might damp the general joy, or awaken a single fear, where the reins are so fully given to hope. The line of discussion we have pursued, does, however, on this occasion, require us to express some fears that the glow of generous feeling which has been excited by so many important, and, as to many of the circumstances, unlooked-for occurrences; the satisfaction which a virtuous people feels on the fall of elevated villainy, and the pleasure which the restoration of a legitimate and respectable sovereign to his throne could not fail in this country to excite, may have tended to lull those suspicions and

"jealous
"to w
"dispo
"to a
"whic
"of ge
"all f
"perly
"no w
"or re
"haps
"be g
"the l
"with
"more
"der
"But
"Bon
"the
"syste
"in th
"gifts
"Fran
"by h
"load
"her
"to b
"seem
"Allie
"We
"anot
"Pow
"that
"she v
"of g
"pers
"of F
"narr
"a B
"nani
"Eng
"all h
"selve
"shou
"ing
"wha
"such
"thos
"rend
"to s
"Rev
"all
"the
"in
"shou
"mul
"able
"enjo
"insu

"jealousies of France, which ought ever
 "to wake in the breast of a Briton, and to
 "dispose both the public and the ministry
 "to a false and mischievous principle,
 "which has been sanctified under the name
 "of generosity. We have no objection to
 "all for which that is the term, when pro-
 "perly understood, and we have certainly
 "no wish to perpetuate feelings of enmity
 "or revenge towards France. It is per-
 "haps the best political reason which can
 "be given for our joy at the restoration of
 "the Bourbons, that we can be at peace
 "with France under the ancient family,
 "more in the spirit of peace than when un-
 "der a base and unprincipled usurpation.
 "But let us not ignorantly forget that tho'
 "Bonaparte be overthrown, France is still
 "the same; that she is radically and
 "systematically our enemy; and let us not,
 "in the folly of our good nature, pour those
 "gifts and offerings into the hands of
 "France, because she has been compelled
 "by her sufferings to ease herself of the
 "load of an oppressor, which may strengthen
 "her for future aggressions. France is
 "to be placed as before the war; this
 "seems to have been the principle of the
 "Allies, when negotiating with Bonaparte.
 "We then heard it echoed from one to
 "another, that England was the only
 "Power who had sacrifices to make, and
 "that she was willing to make them. If
 "she was presumed to possess this degree
 "of good nature when Bonaparte was the
 "person proposed to remain on the Throne
 "of France, at least she is not expected to
 "narrow her generosity, now it is filled by
 "a Bourbon. Now, it may be very mag-
 "nanimous in the Allies to propose that
 "England should give back to France
 "all her conquered Colonies; but for our-
 "selves we see not why a British Statesman
 "should admire this magnanimity of mak-
 "ing free with other people's property, or
 "what justice to the nation there is in
 "such proposals. It is easy enough for
 "those Powers who have nothing to sur-
 "render, in order to accomplish the object,
 "to speak of placing France as before the
 "Revolution; but it must be shown why
 "all the Allied Powers shall depart from
 "the contest with the fruit of success
 "in their pockets, and Great Britain
 "should go away rather stripped and
 "mulcted than rewarded for her honour-
 "able perseverance, or rather suffered to
 "enjoy the fair acquirements of her own
 "insulated valour and exertions. Why,

"when Russia gets Finland. Sweden,
 "Norway; and Austria and Prussia old
 "territories, which they had for ever given
 "up for lost, England, whilst all others
 "gain, should lose? Why, when they in-
 "crease their power, she should diminish
 "her's? We have seen no reason given
 "which is not too absurd to answer. Eng-
 "land has made sacrifices, she has been
 "for twenty years making sacrifices for
 "the independence of Europe; why then
 "should she be required to make additional
 "ones? Her vast national debt shows the
 "sacrifices she has made; and if Austria,
 "Russia, and Prussia, can plead pecuniary
 "sacrifices also, we shall demand why they
 "are to be allowed to balance them with
 "an extension of territory, whilst Great
 "Britain is to retain her debt, and at the
 "same time diminish her possessions? The
 "gross injustice of the requisition, and the
 "gross folly of countenancing it by the
 "cant of not being behind in magnanimity,
 "is most apparent from the consideration,
 "that there is no reciprocity implied in
 "such an arrangement as shall restore the
 "conquered Colonies to France. The other
 "Allies gain independence and territory
 "by the defeat of the French; but Great
 "Britain gains neither. She was inde-
 "pendent before, and would have remain-
 "ed so; she had lost no territory, and
 "therefore had none to recover. All she
 "gains is the liberty of trading with the
 "Continent; and in that trade the Allies
 "are as much interested as she; and are
 "we then to purchase from France this
 "liberty by the cession of Colonies, when
 "France has no right, and now no power,
 "to prevent us from enjoying it? In every
 "view the idea of such surrenders is pre-
 "posterous."

Upon the subject of Colonies I might
 first address myself to the English nation,
 and ask them what benefit they could pro-
 mise to themselves by such an extension of
 dominion, and that too, of a kind not at all
 contributing to our security or happiness.
 I much question, whether the restoration
 of Colonies to France would be any real
 benefit to her. We have seen, that she
 has not wanted the aid of Colonies in her
 late wars: and, perhaps, it might be well
 for her, if we must consider her as radically
 the enemy of Great Britain, that the latter
 should expand her wings of conquest and
 dominion over all the Colonies in the known
 world, as the most likely means of produc-
 ing her final weakness and ruin, as the ex-

tension of dominion has now produced the want of the power of resistance in France. But, all that I, or any one else, might be able to urge on these topics; however clearly we might be able to shew, that inflated dominion, that external resources, that borrowed vigour, all tend to the final fall of States, and however numerous the instances by which we might illustrate and enforce this position, nothing that we could say would affect the object of this writer's observations and doctrines, which is manifestly to cause the people of England to believe, that, to give up Colonies to France would tend to give her *strength*, and that we ought to do all that we can to keep her in a state of *feebleness*; and, envy out of the question, for the present, we will now inquire upon what *grounds* the justice of this is endeavoured to be upheld.

It is alledged, that England ought to give nothing up to France, because the rest of the Allies *give nothing up to her*. This is not true; for the rest of the Allies give up all that part of France, of which they have possession; and it is notorious to all the world, that, without them, we could not remain in France for a single hour. *They*, we are told, *all get something*, and we nothing. They cannot *all gain*, seeing that Europe is no larger than it was before. If, upon the whole, they get no territory, why should we? But, if the King of Great Britain gets nothing, the Elector of Hanover does; for how has Hanover been recovered but by the exertions of the Allies? We are told, that they get territories which they had given up as gone for ever. And did not we look upon dear Hanover as gone for ever? Besides, we are told, that we get nothing but trade with the Continent. Do we not get, or see, *Antwerp* out of the hands of France, and also the ports at the mouth of the Scheldt? What prevents the Allies from suffering Antwerp to become a great maritime arsenal? What prevents them from erecting here a formidable enemy to our fleets? And, if they do not do that, do we gain nothing? Have we gained nothing in the fleet of Denmark; in the Dutch fleet; in the fleet of Spain; in the destruction of almost the whole of the maritime force of the House of Bourbon? What, after all this, will any reasonable man say, if we still cling to the Colonies of France, still hold them, lest France, which we represent as being in the lowest abyss of beggary, should become too powerful? But,

OUR VAST NATIONAL DEBT! Yes, may it please your Majesty, it is, indeed, a thumper. It requires thirty-eight millions of pounds sterling to pay the interest of it; or, in French livres, 912 millions; a sum, I believe, twice as great as Napoleon was ever able to get from his forty-four millions of people, to carry on all his undertakings and all his wars. This sum, this sum necessary to pay the interest of our debt alone, is enough to make one's head swim to think of. But these same writers are, at other times, continually assuring us, that this debt is nothing of serious import, and they even go so far as to assert, that it is an indisputable proof of our *prosperity*. At any rate, I hope that your Majesty will take care not to run the risk of such a debt, reflecting on the fatal consequences which a former debt produced to your family. But, this debt of ours. Have we not had the expending of the money? Have we not, in our wars, had the money's worth? If we have paid *money*, Europe has found *men*. Are we to have the services for the money in the first instance, and then demand dominions for the money at last? This is a sort of double-handed game, reduceable, I conceive, to no acknowledged, or even supposed, principle of equity. Besides, upon what ground are *you* (for you it is) to be called upon to leave in our hands any equivalent for this debt? You were not the cause of its being contracted; the war was never professed to be carried on for *you*. We made a treaty of peace and friendship with him, whom we now call the usurper of your throne. We carried on the war, as we professed, for "*truly British objects*." If we say, that we have taken the Colonies for ourselves, and that you and your interests are out of the question—that is fair; but, then, let us not be permitted to claim from you any *gratitude*, and to request you to *disarm* your people for *our sake*.

But, that all these pretexts are false appears from the context; for this same writer calls upon us to remember, that "*though Napoleon be overthrown, France is still the same*." What! Is there no difference? After all, is there nothing effected? Is France still as dangerous to us as she was before? Why, if she be "*radically and systematically our enemy*," what have we done? What have we gained? If there is to be "*war with Amalek from generation to generation*," what is become of the subject of our recent re-

joice
cand
the l
wint
be "
"my
lion
in ta
our g
notes
Wha
Fran
we in
vers
tend,
Fr
hood,
to con
your
that,
tion
Press
vail u
and d
people
alread
tuate
Englis
have s
I only
people
that it
ing the
to sligh
your p
those
plunge
wars.

N. I
off the
tion, u
pone, t
compar
thing o

SU

THE
copious
here, t
Debate
cept the
one par
be kept
or, at le
part of
nor, ind

joicings? Why have we wasted so many candles, such rivers of oil, and stripped the laurels off the few leaves which the winter had not turned brown? If France be "radically and systematically our enemy," to what end have we spent 800 millions of additional debt and 400 millions in taxes? To what end have we saddled our great great grand-children (if Bank-notes last) with such an enormous load? What! Have we done this to restore to France a *paternal government*? Have we incurred all this expence, and shed rivers of blood to give happiness, as we pretend, to our radical and systematic enemy?

From this mass of inconsistency, falsehood, vanity, envy, and malignity, I turn to conclude, in a few words addressed to your Majesty. You will now clearly see, that, in this country, no very small portion of that powerful instrument, the Press, is employed in endeavours to prevail upon the Allied Powers to impose hard and disgraceful terms upon you and your people; that this same press is beginning already to endeavour to revive and perpetuate deadly animosity in the breasts of Englishmen against France. When you have seen the clear proof of these facts, I only wish you, your ministers, and your people, to observe and to bear in mind, that it is this *same press* which is wearying the very air with their advice to you, to slight and degrade your army, to break your promised amnesty, and to adopt all those vindictive measures calculated to plunge France into long and bloody civil wars.

N. B. The King of France having put off the final arrangement of the Constitution, until the 31st of May, I shall postpone, till after that time, my proposed comparison between it and our happy thing of the same name.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

THE RECKONING.—This is a most copious subject, and I can only just notice here, that it is said, in the Parliamentary Debate Reports, that the *War Taxes*, except the trifling duty on goods going from one part of the *coast* to the other, are to be *kept on* for another year, at any rate; or, at least, there is no promise that any part of them shall be sooner taken off; nor, indeed, that they shall be taken off

even then.—But, how could a generous people expect it, after having approved of a treaty to pay for 600 thousand men to be kept on foot against France? We cannot eat the cake and have it too. We cannot expect to have all these services, and all this glory without paying for it. "What!" exclaim the patriotic maidens of fixed incomes, "are we to still pay the Property Tax, now that the monster Bonaparte is overthrown?" But, my dear ladies, pray bear in mind, that you must expect to pay the *Reckoning*. There are 600,000 Austrians, Prussians and Russians, Croats and Cossacks, who have been fighting for us in defence of freedom, social order, and religion; and would you not *pay* for their return home to their own happy countries? Do you consider what might have been the consequence, if a French army had got into England? Reflect; pray reflect a little upon the terrible risk which you ran. And, if you do that, I will not believe, that you will grudge to pay the Property Tax for the rest of your lives. Besides, will not this tax go, in part, into the pockets of those, who, as officers, have been serving in our army, and whose half pay is now to be augmented? Have you not relations amongst these? And, how do you expect that they are to be supported without taxes? Have we not the Duke of Wellington, that "first captain of the age," as our newspapers call him; have we not him and his noble comrades to reward? And, would *you* not share in the expence of rewarding those, who, in all human probability, have contributed to the preservation of your lives; nay, more, your *honour*? Good Heaven! when you reflect upon the services rendered you, can you complain of the continuation of the Property Tax, which only takes from you one pound note out of every ten? O, fie, Ladies!

AMERICAN WAR.—Some mention has

been made of this in Parliament; but I must put off my remarks till my next.

JOHN BULL'S SECOND THOUGHT.

MR EDITOR—It is now said France is subjugated, and restored to the Bourbon family in a crippled state.—Norway, we are told, is bartered away to Sweden, whom we are to assist in securing possession of it. America, we are assured, is to be abandoned by the Allies for us to RECOLONIZE it! The Allies, our Allies, will have gloriously fought for, and obtained, the Liberties of Europe. Peace is to be universal and permanent. They boast that we shall all be *happy* under the paternal sway of our own legitimate Sovereigns!—and that discontent will not exist, or at least will be compelled to hide its head! But it has happened, before now, that a man, after struggling hard with a disease, has, even after the disease has been subdued, miserably fallen a victim to the medicines which have been administered!—We have seen a coalition of different Sovereigns overcome the most powerful nation, and the most skilful General in Europe. Whatever may be the ostensible pretence for this, the real cause will be found in the French having first made laws for their Monarch, and next having beheaded him—crimes most unpardonable in civilized Europe, and among regular Governments. In cases of murder, it is well known that length of time does not occasion prescription. If we look into our own history, then, it will be seen that we have been equally guilty as the French. Did we not behead Charles? did we not confiscate the church land? Did we not send James and his family a packing? How come we, then, to throw the first stone? By means of a *Coalition* we succeeded—aye, and another *Coalition* may speedily inflict a similar punishment on us.—Coalitions may now become the order of the day; and if *interest*, sometimes denominated public good by Princes, should step in, a *Coalition* against England would be full as practicable as one against France. It may be said that such *Coalition* would fail for want of money; that, in the present war, we had been the bankers of the Allies. Yes, with a vengeance, we have sent them our money and reserved only our bills; so that this very argument overturns itself; for if we have given the Allies money, they, or their subjects, are now in the actual possession of it, while we are compelled to substitute

paper for gold; a measure open also to any new *Coalition* that might be formed against us. If it be argued, that the nation is still very rich, it is answered, that the greater will be the incitement for plunder. The resources of the Allies in men are immense, and as we cannot prevent the increase of their shipping, they may shortly, and very shortly too, make the liberty of the seas their pretence, and prove equally successful as when fighting for the liberties of the land! perhaps even now the storm is gathering!—The expected arrival of the Allied Sovereigns in this country may tend to accelerate the event. They will be received with pomp, with ceremony, with acclamations, with illuminations, and with fêtes.—To them, as was done by Hezekiah to the ambassadors of Belodack Baladan, Prince of Babylon, will be shewn, in full display, *all our riches* and their sources. The very magnificence of their reception by their princely host; the luxury of a Lord Mayor's feast, and the splendid appearance which will be assumed by all those who will be permitted to approach the royal visitors, will give birth to reflections as to the *manner* in which such wealth was acquired, and the means employed for securing its immense influx.—Some deep-sighted politician may whisper, that *it is owing to the sovereignty of the seas*. To the Sovereign of all the Russias, he may add, that this little Island might have room to dance in one of his Imperial Majesty's provinces. Why, then, he may ask, should not Russia have as extended a commerce, and an equal share of the sovereignty of the seas? It may also be hinted, that a certain portion may be granted the confederates, for their assistance in recovering the whole.—With the aid of England, might these confederates argue, we have just conquered a country containing thirty millions of inhabitants; with the aid of these we may easily subdue a population of ten millions, and of these ten millions a twentieth part, at the least, will gladly transplant themselves and their manufactures to the Continent. Thus we may free the seas and increase our commerce, &c. &c.—As the visit of the two Emperors, however, is unavoidable, it may, perhaps, be more to the profit of the country, if, in their reception, we display less of our luxury and more of our poverty. Let them be conducted to our prisons and our poor-houses, and to our decaying manufacturing towns; let them enter the peasant's half-thatched

cottage—let them be made acquainted with the magnitude of our National Debt—with the immense sums annually collected by Government, and the way in which it is distributed; let them inform themselves, *providing they do not divulge it in this country*, of the immense quantity of paper now in circulation; and thus, after dining at a luxurious board, and when retiring to rest on a splendid couch, they will naturally conclude, that however great the commercial resources are in England, want predominates; that, though luxury abounds at Court and among the great, nine-tenths of the people have misery to their share; and that, upon the whole, England is like a certain bird, which, having more feather than flesh, is not worth powder and shot.—Prudence will, however, suggest to us that we ought to keep up our large standing army and not disband our militia; that we ought to have recourse to a Conscription, a Landwher, or a Landstrum; and, at all events, that we ought to send our foreign legions out of the country, lest, in the heat of battle, they should go over in a body to the enemy. Let us by the experience of others grow wise, and avoid the fate of Napoleon at Leipsic.—On the other hand, as the people are now content to bear heavy taxes, they will not murmur at their continuance. Government may, therefore, still subsidize, as usual, only changing the object, and instead of making them the cement of a coalition, let the subsidies be converted to the promotion of discord; for it is much better to *prevent* a coalesced invasion than to repel it: and it must be remembered this country has often been reduced by invaders, and that what has heretofore been effected by *one* invading nation may more assuredly be within the verge of possibility, when attempted by a COALITION OF ALL EUROPE. ARISTIDES.

FRANCE.—The following are some additional articles of the new French Constitution, which have transpired since I last adverted to the progress of the revolution in that country:—

Civil List.—The Civil List (or the funds of the annual expenditure of the King) is fixed at *twenty-five millions of francs*, exclusive of his private demesnes and those of the Crown.—The King to support his civil and military household. The *maximum* in point of number for the latter is determined.—The annual expen-

diture of the brother of the King is calculated at one-fourth, exclusive of the private property and the appendages.—That of the nephews at the sixteenth part.—The maintenance of the children of France, in the direct line from the King, male and female, will be hereafter provided for.

The Conscription.—The continuance of the Conscription is *abolished*.—The Peace and War Establishments of the Army will be fixed by the law, which will in like manner determine the modes and extent of the recruiting service.—The military expenditure of each year.—The way in which advances shall be made.—Similar regulations with respect to the marine establishments.—The provision for the army retained in active service, and that for retired or pensioned officers, and soldiers, will be taken into serious consideration.—The marines will experience a similar attention.

Question of Peace and War.—The rights of Peace and of War shall appertain to the Legislative Bodies conjointly, subject to the following limitation:—War cannot be decided upon but by the special decree of the Two Chambers, upon the formal and necessary proposition of the King, and sanctioned by his Majesty.

Public Liberty.—The care of the external relations of the kingdom; the maintenance of the rights and possessions of the kingdom; the care of its political relations; the military preparations, with reference to those of neighbouring States; and the repelling imminent or incipient hostilities, is entrusted to the King. But in cases of extraordinary movements of the forces of the State, the King shall, without delay, give notice of the same to the Legislative Bodies, and make known the causes and objects thereof. And if the Legislature be not then sitting, the same shall be immediately convoked by his Majesty.—When the Legislative Bodies shall deem the causes and objects legitimate and admissible, *war shall be declared by the King in the name of the French nation*. It shall then be deemed national, and the necessary supplies shall be provided.

—If the Two Chambers shall decide that war ought not to be made, the King shall order his Ministers, on their responsibility, to adopt, without delay, measures for the cessation or prevention of all hostility.—It appertains to the King to conclude and sign all treaties of peace, alliance, and commerce, and other conventions with Foreign Powers, which he shall deem ad-

vantageous for the State; but such treaties and conventions shall not take effect until they be ratified by the Legislative Bodies. With respect, however, to the general Peace about to be concluded in Paris between the Emperors and Kings in person, and with the Minister Plenipotentiary of England, in case the Prince of Wales should not personally assist, as eagerly desired by the French.—This Peace, which is so nearly connected with our internal tranquillity, will be secured by Constitutional Institutions.—This Peace, in short, so long desired, concluded after too long an interval of tyranny, shall be definitively concluded and signed by the King, with the different Powers, without the necessity of any ratification by the Legislative Bodies.

Acceptance of the Constitution.—The Constitution shall be forwarded to the Departmental Authorities, for the Acceptance of the French people in the manner hereinafter prescribed:—The King will afterwards declare his acceptation to the Provisional Government in these terms—"I accept the Constitution, I swear to observe it, and to cause it to be observed."—The mode of its acceptation, on the part of the French people will be by the opening of the Registries in each Commune.—The suffrages will be received during fifteen days by the respective Mayors, and will be expressed after the names of individuals, by "*Oui*," or "*Non*."—Duplicates shall be made of the Registries, one copy of which shall be transmitted to the Provisional Government, or to Monsieur, Lieut.-General of the Kingdom, who will proclaim the general vote of the French in the following month.—The other duplicate shall be deposited in the archives of each Department. Neither Holland or Italy shall participate in the votes.—The other countries united to Antient France in 1789, or in 1792, shall not vote till after the pacification. Their acceptance shall not therefore be the less valid.—After the double acceptation shall consummate the social compact, the King shall issue a Proclamation as follows:—"Louis XVIII. by the Grace of God, and the Constitutional Law of the State, King of the French (or of France, according to the majority of opinion in the acceptation), to all present and to come, &c."—The King will renew his Oath at the sacred solemnity of his Coronation. After which the Constituted Authorities shall enter upon the regular dis-

charge of their respective functions, according to the instructions of the Government.

PARIS, MAY 2.—*Declaration of the King.*—"Louis, by the Grace of God, King of France and Navarre, to all those to whom these presents shall come, greeting:—Recalled by the love of our people to the Throne of our fathers—enlightened by the misfortunes of the nation which we are destined to govern, the first wish of our heart is to invoke that mutual confidence so necessary to our repose, to our happiness. After having carefully read the Plan of the Constitution proposed by the Senate, in the Sitting of the 6th of April last, we acknowledge that the bases of it were good; but that there being a great number of articles bearing the impression of the precipitancy with which they were drawn up, they cannot in their present form become fundamental laws of the State. Resolved to adopt a liberal Constitution, we wish that it should be wisely combined, and as we cannot accept of one which it is indispensable to correct, we convene for the 10th of June, in the present year, the Senate and Legislative Body, with intent to lay before them the business which we shall have prepared, with a Select Committee from the bosom of these two Bodies, and to give for a basis to this Constitution the following bases:—

The Representative Government shall be maintained as it at present exists, divided into two Bodies, viz.—The Senate and the Chamber, composed of Deputies of the Departments.—Taxes shall be granted with consent.—Public and private liberty secured.—The Liberty of the Press respected, saving the precautions necessary to the public tranquillity.—Religious liberty secured.—Property shall be inviolable and sacred; the sale of national property shall be irrevocable.—The Ministers, responsible, may be prosecuted by one of the Legislative Bodies, and tried by the other.—The Judges are not removeable, and the judicial power is independent.—The public debt shall be guaranteed. Pensions, rank, and military honours shall be preserved; as also the old and the new Nobility.—The Legion of Honour, the decoration of which we will determine, shall be maintained.—Every Frenchman shall be admissible to civil and military employments.—Finally, no person shall be molested for his opinions and votes.—LOUIS.